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Admonition for Posterity by Mirza Muhammad bin Mu‘tamad Khān

During the early eighteenth century, the process of political decline clearly emerged on the surface. However, men of letters continued to pour out works of excellent quality throughout the period.¹ The writers of all genres proved to be fully alert in their respective fields. Despite of variant turmoil of everyday existence, they did not compromise on the quality of their works. In fact with gradual loss of power, there was corresponding rise in cultural activities². Books were written in greater number to serve different purposes. Some of these were written for the author himself. One of such work is ‘Ibrat Nāma written by Mirza Muhammad Bin Mu‘tamad Khān³.

Not much information exists about the early years of life and education of Mirza Muhammad. He writes that he was born at Jalālabād (suba Kabul) in 21 Jumādā I 1070 A.H. in the third R.Y. of Aurangzeb⁴. Mu‘tamad Khān (Mirza Rustam) the father of author was deputy governor for Prince Muhammad Mu‘azzam (later Bahādur Shāh). He obtained an introduction through Lala Shiv Dās Khatrī, the governor’s chief man of business. Khwāja Muhammad Amīn Kashmirī (a noble) who had once been also in Khān-i-Jahān Kokaltāsh’s service and replaced Mutamid Khān at Lahore who held the rank of 500 there⁵. However, Mu‘tamad Khān was continuously employed in the imperial service and died at age of sixty nine years in the reign of Aurangzeb⁶. The author Mirza Muhammad was employed in Deccan through mediation of Nawāb Ruḥ-

¹ Khān Javed ‘Alî, Early Urdu Historiography, op. cit., p. 43.
³ The original manuscript is preserved in Bankipur Patna and it is complete, in good shape and covering 121 folios. Its Rotograph No. 247 is available in the Research Seminar Library, Department of History, A.M.U. ‘Alī garh.
⁴ According to Harman Ethe, Mirza Muhammad was born on 21st Jamādā I, in the thirtieth year of ‘Ālamgīr’s reign, which is 1098 A.H/ 1687A.D and not 1070 A.H, as it is written by mistake here. But internal evidence shows that the correct date of birth of this author seems 1070 A.H. Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of India office, op. cit., p. 146.
⁵ ‘Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 78ab.
⁶ Ibid., f. 2a.
ullāh Khān. In the beginning, he got a modest mansab of 150 and his brother ‘Abdur Raheem was appointed on the mansab of 100. Later on, he was promoted to the mansab of 250 zāt and 20 suwār through good of office of a noble ‘Āmir Khān. He held the post of khawāsan (pages/attendant) and continued on the same post in the reign of Bahādur Shāh. At one place he mentions the name of his uncle Mansur Khān and his son Mirza Muhammad Qibad. During the reign of Bahādur Shāh, he was able to receive an enhanced mansab of 700 zāt and 100 suwār and remained very close to Nawāb Mukhlis Khān, who was his real uncle as well7. The author also mentions that he was appointed by Bahādur Shāh to assist Prince Rafī-ush-Shān in the Sikh campaign. During the reign of Jahāndār Shāh, he remained close to a noble ‘Āmir Khān. For the reign of Jahāndār Shāh and Farru Khān Siyar, he writes that mostly lower clan used to get high post (aksar past ruthbāh ba darajāt-i-baland rasheed) and there was no support of such Khānāzadān like him, so he made himself aloof from the court8. Later on, some of his close friends recommended him in the court of Emperor Farru Khān Siyar. He was appointed on the post of ‘Āmil and was send to confiscate the property of Late Jalāl Khān Ruhillāh9 and thereafter he was appointed in Rahun by his supporter ‘Inayat-ullāh Khān. Furthermore, in the reign of Farru Khān Siyar, the writer was recalled to Deccan by Saif-ullāh Khān, whom he served for long time in Deccan. However due to insufficient means of traveling, he was not able to set out for Deccan10.

Mirza Muhammad Khān was the master and maternal uncle of Muhammad Bakhsh Ashub11, who has written the history of Muhammad Shāh. At many places the

---

7 ‘Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 7b.
8 Ibid., f. 75b.
9 Ibid., f. 80a.
10 Ibid., f. 104b.
11 Muhammad Bakhsh Ashub is the writer of famous work Tārīkh-i-Shādāt Farru Khān Siyar wa Julus-i-Muhammad Shāh. He was a soldier by profession and closely connected with the Mughal Court. He participated in many battles and then retired to Lucknow, where he was introduced to Jonathan Scott, who persuaded him to write this history. This work starts with the death of Farru Khān Siyar and ends with the death of Zakariya Khān, Tārīkh-i-Shādāt Farru Khān Siyar wa Julus-i-Muhammad Shāh, Rotographs No. 69 & 70, C.A.S, Department of History, A.M.U, Aligarh.
author mentions the name of Khūsh-hāl Chand as one of his close friends. In the writing, he mentions the name of some other friends like, Bahai Saiyid Mirza and Mirza Zamān as well. The name and promotions of his brother always appears with the name of the author, but he does not give any information about his own son and any other personal information. As mentioned above, he held the post of attendant (Khwasān ba Irāq) upon Aurangzeb and Bahādur Shāh for many years and was witness to some of the most confidential consultations by Emperors. Therefore, we can say that the information on administration enclosed in the ‘Ibrat Nāma is more supplementary and believable and fairly authentic.

Other work of this author is Tārīḵ-i-Muhammadī which contains brief notices of political events and the dates related to members of the royal family, nobles, mansabdārs, chiefs and scholars of the eighteenth century.

Purpose

The author has not acknowledged about the purpose of his writing. In the introduction of this work, he only refers that he wants to write about himself and about his contemporaries. D.N Marshal says that the motive which induced Mirza Muhammad for writing was, he found his contemporary writers’ works deficient and far for from accurate. So he decided to write an accurate work in the form of memoir. It seems from this writing that he has not consulted anything from other earlier written source. His work appears simply an observation of an independent eyewitness, who has written without any partisan and prejudiced. Unlike his contemporaries, this work is largely free from subjectivity. But the title of the work suggests that, this work was written for the purpose of seeking lesson from his writing. He starts this work from the starting of his employment in the last year of Aurangzeb and covers till the accession of Raḍū-d-Darajāt. He has not only mentioned about himself and ruling Emperors, but also covers biographical notices of some important nobles of that period as well. He has started the
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12 Khushal Chand is the author of Tārīḵ-i-Muhammad Shāhi or (Tārīḵ-i-Nādir-uz-Zamānī). It is general history of India composed in 1152/1739-40. The author was a writer in diwānī office of Delhi, at the time of Muhammad Shāh, History of History writing in Medieval India, op. cit., p. 59.

13 Muḥgal Bibliography, op. cit., p. 99.

14 ‘Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 1a.
account from first day of his employment during the reign of Aurangzeb and end with the account of deposition of Farrukh Siyar. We also do not find any information about the author’s later life from the other sources as well. Particularly, author has not given title to this account, but he calls himself very often as țāqim-i-‘Ibrat Nāma (author of ‘Ibrat Nāma)\textsuperscript{15}.

**Style**

Author himself declares that his account is simple and straight. He is anxious to record his own account and about his age in the form of Roznāmcha (diary). For him, everything depends on the will of God and he also seeks His blessing. Generally, he has written this account in simple and plain language in chronological order, but whenever eloquence is required the style becomes labored and complicated\textsuperscript{16}. He has followed a very rich chronology and every event is written in Hijri era with the name of Arabic month and day and dates. Due to strict following of chronology, he breaks the flow of his narration and presents the same in many parts. Within the year, events are described strictly in the sequence of their happening. Indeed in order to maintain his sequence, Mirza Muhammad breaks the continuity of event. If the occurrence of event is prolonged in time, meanwhile if other events also take place, the author begins with describing the first event, snaps the thread of description with writing it would be in next date (\textit{dar tawārīkh ayendā khawāhād āmad}) and then other events intervenes in point of sequence and narrates those and then resumes his narrative of the first by writing as written earlier (\textit{sābiq mazkūr shavad}). However, this does not fundamentally alter the character of each event as an individual entity but breaks the flow of narration. The thread of continuity snapped at one place can easily be picked up at another. In preserving this continuity and the fundamental unity of the event, the author’s reference back and forth are of immense assistance\textsuperscript{17}.

His script of writing is \textit{Tâliq mix} with \textit{Shikastā} which is difficult in reading. Most of the events start with heading \textit{waqā‘i} and around ten \textit{waqā‘i} were written. Generally,

\textsuperscript{15}‘Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., ff. 39a & 11a.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., f. 37a.
\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., ff.19b, 46a & 48b.
all the accounts are written with proper headings. *Julūs* year was also followed by the author. The author has used many Arabic quotations wherever required\(^\text{18}\). Several Hindi words were used by him as well. This work is mainly free from poetical quotation except at the end, where he has employed few poetical quotations\(^\text{19}\). He is eye witness for the whole account, but for some part of this report he has based on the reliable person whom he had full trust. In between the line of this work, he has acknowledged with his brother on several places. He has used a word *banda* (slave) for himself and never fails to mention the names of the intermediaries, through he got an audience with the present Emperor. This work does not exhibit much literary talent and it is not written in any ornate style. The language is fairly simple and vigorous, but not pompous and highly polished. Qurānic quotations of moral reflection have been used, but the dates are invariably given in Arabic rather than Persian. The narration owing to long sentences is often evolved rather disjointed and even fragmentary. There is seldom any difficulty in comprehending the exact meaning of the author. He cannot be accused of uncouth flattery, both in forms and style or willful concealment of facts. His way of writing is direct without any phrase or poetic exuberance. He has adopted a very straight mode of saying facts and does not to fail to criticize the character of Emperor.

For the source materials of this work, it seems he depends mainly on his personal testimony than on any documentary research. He has not acknowledged any official documents for compilation of this work. He writes mostly about what he had seen or heard or what he had himself been as a party. Whatever he had seen or heard, he has tried to enrich by his own view and comments. It is noteworthy that author generally begins every event through establishing the date and place of occurrence. Other significance of this work is that on failing to recall the dates for the matter like Maharājā Ajit Singh’s account and others, he clearly accepts about his forgetting dates (*i̲j̲u̲h̲āl t̲ā̲r̲ī̲k̲h̲*)\(^\text{20}\). On the other hand this confession attests to the author’s awareness of the significance of chronology. Significance of his writing is demonstrated from his intimate

---

\(^\text{18}\) *Ibrat Nāma*, op. cit., ff. 1ab, 6a, 19b &120a.
\(^\text{19}\) *Ibid.*, f. 120ab.
and enlivening details of events of the period which he describes with own full knowledge and impression of the general atmosphere.

Mirza Muhammad writes about the death of Emperor ‘Ālamgīr and offers very brief account for the civil war among the sons of ‘Ālamgīr\(^{21}\). For Bahādur Shāh, he applauds him as Shāh Alam *Daryādīl* (bountiful as the sea). From his writing, it is evident that he was on the side of ‘Āzam Shāh, but gave very brief account of battle of Jaju. After this battle he received an audience of Emperor through Nawāb Mukhlis Khān and he was promoted on the *mansab* of 400/50. He also mentions about the civil war between Bahādur Shāh and Muhammad Kām Bakhsh and about his death with his son\(^{22}\).

For the reign of Bahādur Shāh, he has furnished details about the problems created by Sikhs, Jāts and mainly about *kachhwāhas* Rajput of Amber and *Rathors* of Jodhpur. Only little information like the influence of prince ‘Azim-ush-Shān and causes of the further civil war is noticed by him. For the campaign against Rajputs, he says that moving leisurely; the royal encampment reached Amber, the capital of Jai Singh, towards the end of January, 1708 A.D. There was a dispute for *Kachhwāha* throne between the two brothers, Jai Singh and Vijay Singh, Bahādur Shāh directed that the state should be confiscated to the imperial establishment, the name of the town should be changed to Islamabad and Saiyid Ahmad Sa‘id Khān Bārha should be sent there as a ‘new’ *faujdār*. The Emperor camped in Amber for three days during which the town was abandoned by the inhabitants. The *mustasaddi* proceeded to confiscate the goods of Jai Singh, but these were returned to him soon after, and the kingdom was conferred on Vijay Singh for short time. Later it was conferred on Rājā Jai Singh\(^{23}\). The detailed events of various crisis faced by state just after the death of the Bahādur Shāh, were discussed by him. Mirza Muhhammad also writes about his presence and of his brother in Lahore\(^{24}\).

At the beginning the author has also discussed about Solar eclipse (*kasuf-i-Aftab*) and writes about the duration of eclipse that it continued till two *sa‘at* and five *ghari* and

\(^{21}\) *‘Ibrat Nāma*, op. cit., f. 3ab.
\(^{22}\) *Ibid.*, ff. 5b-6a.
\(^{23}\) *Ibid.*, ff. 56a-59b.
further writes that it was so dark and even stars appeared in the sky\textsuperscript{25}. He further mentions about two abnormal children, born in Delhi near Lāhori Darwāza in the house of a poor family. Those children had two heads but their bodies were joined and seemed as one similar to other normal baby\textsuperscript{26}.

Mirza Muhammad, who was also present in battle of Lahore, gives detail account of all the sons of Bahādur Shāh but the role of Zu’lfiqār Khān was not much written by him. He has discussed the reason of uniting all the three brothers of Jahāndār Shāh against Prince ‘Azim-ush-Shān as well. Then further writes about all the leading nobles who fought and were killed in this war. He evaluates the treasury of ‘Azim-ush-Shān as \textit{Ganj-i-Qāroon} but he does not mention about his side in this battle, most likely he was present in ‘Azim-ush-Shān’s camp\textsuperscript{27}.

He offers very brief account for the battle with Jahān Shāh. Regarding vulnerable condition of Rafī-us-Shān, he writes as, at the midnight he dismounted from his elephant and called all chief men around him for council of war. Prince Rafī-ush-Shān suggests that as Jahāndār Shāh and his men are exhausted, we should attack him at once but others objected to fight in the dark. So they did not reach at final conclusion. Anxious and disheartened Prince again ascended his elephant and waited wearily for the dawn. But Mirza Muhammad does not mention about the agreement which was made among the brothers before the battle of Lahore\textsuperscript{28}.

It seems that the author was not happy with Jahāndār Shāh as his uncle Mukhlis Khān was killed by his order. He writes long detail of imperial journey of Jahāndār Shāh from Lahore to Delhi\textsuperscript{29}. On several places he point out the misbehavior of Emperor Jahāndār Shāh and also attributes it as the main cause of his defeat. For the battle of Khwāja, he says that Prince ‘Aziz-ud-Dīn was placed under the guidance of two men, Khwāja Husain Khān-i-Daurān brother in law of Kokaltāsh Khān and Lutf-ullāh Khān Sādiq, the personal \textit{dīwān} of Prince. He has highlighted the bad temper of Khwāja

\textsuperscript{25}\textit{Ibrat Nāma}, op. cit., f. 5b.
\textsuperscript{26}\textit{Ibid.}, f. 5b.
\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Ibid.}, f. 9a.
\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid.}, ff. 9b-10b.
\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Ibid.}, ff. 11b-12b.
Husain and about his unpopularity among his soldiers. He cites that these appointments were made even after opposition of Zu’lfiqār Khān and plausibly these nobles were also the cause of fleeing of Prince ‘Aziz-ud-Dīn. The battle of Agra and the reason for its defeat is briefly mentioned in this work. The role played by Saiyid Brothers for the cause of Farrukh Siyar is marked by this author. Mirza Muhammad mentions about himself that he was not able to take part in this battle and because of insufficient means of travelling which forced him to stay back at Delhi. But he states that he was deeply concerned for the result of this battle (ghosh bar awāz dāshtem).

In this writing, author has also narrated early life of Farrukh Siyar. He writes the relation of Farrukh Siyar with Saiyids and role of Khwāja Asim for the cause of Farrukh Siyar. He provides information about Muhammad Māh and writes that on the 16th Zil-hijja (13th January 1713 A.D) after dark Jahāndār Shāh with La’l Kunwar entered Talpat, a village thirteen miles from Delhi which had been granted in perpetuity (altaghma) by Jahāndār Shāh to Mohammad Māh. Further he writes that Jahāndār Shāh was still confident on Zu’lfiqār Khān and insisted himself that he must see once more and speak to him. They reached Delhi at the night of 18th Zil-hijjā (15th January 1713 A.D). La’l kunwar went to her own house in the charge of Mohammad Mah, while Jahāndār Shāh went alone to the house of Asad Khān Asaf-ud-Daulā.

Mirza Muhammad writes a clear and in detail about the discussion between the father Asad Khān and his son Zu’lfiqār Khān, but he has not revealed about the source of his information. Through their conversation he wants to show the unpopularity of the Emperor Jahāndār Shāh and says that Zu’lfiqār Khān said to his father, was it right for them to deliver to an enemy a man who had taken refuge at their house? His father replied that, when Bahādur Shāh died, every noble took one side or another and they happened to join that of Jahāndār Shāh what crime had they thereby committed? Besides, if such a captive were made over by them to Farrukh Siyar, what could he do but receive them into favour. Doubtless, it was opposed to the rules of friendship to deliver

---

30 ibrat Nāma, op. cit., ff.12a-15b.
31 ibid., f.17a.
32 ibid.
up Jahāndār Shāh. But everybody detested him, if they espoused his cause not a soul would join them. Here Mrza Muhammad quotes;

(It is not good to handover the Jahāndār Shāh but most of the people dislike him. If, on the fate, we try to support for his cause, nobody will come forward for help and alongside we will lose the image and caught big trouble and top of this, it will not be fruitful effort).

Further Asad Khān consoles his son Zu’lfiqār Khān and says let them rather seek in him an instrument for saving their own lives and property. Zu’lfiqār Khān after some time yielded a reluctant consent made Jahāndār Shāh as prisoner. A joint letter was then dispatched by father and son to Farrukh Siyar.34

Saiyid ‘Abdullāh Khān promised to them that if they entrust themselves to him and his brother’s care, they could made an arrangement that he and his father would not only be presented to the new Emperor, but that not a hair would be touched. Mean while Muhammad Jāfar entitled Taqarrub Khān was sent to kill Jahāndār Shāh.35 Alongside, Mirza Muhammad writes about his promotion and his brother and cousin who were presented to Amīn Chīn Qūlīch Khān Bahādur and through the meditation this noble the suwār rank of the author increased upto 630 and his brother received 520.36

Mirza Mohammad’s account of Zu’lfiqār Khān’s death was obtained from a friend whose truthfulness he fully believed in, but he does not mention about the name of that person. However, he refers that his friend went with a dāli or basket of fruit and vegetable from his own garden to be laid at the new Emperor’s feet as nazar. In

33Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., ff. 17b-18a.
34Ibid., ff. 17b-18a.
36Ibid., f. 26b.
consequence, he had been into the privy chamber and justice hall. Before he could come out, the approach of Asad Khān and his son was announced. When he tried to make his exit, he found that of those inside, no one was allowed to leave the place. He was thus a witness of all that happened. As a consequence, we find a detail and accurate information about the execution of the Zu’lfiqār Khān.

Other eye witness information which was noticed by this author on morning of the 17th Muharram (12th Feb 1713) Farrukh Siyar left Khizarābād and marching in state into Delhi took possession of the palace and its citadel. The new Emperor mounted on an elephant and at his back seat ‘Ibad-ullāh Khān (Mīr Jumlā) waving a peacock fan over his master’s head. The head of Jahāndār Shāh was carried on the point of long bamboo held by an executioner seated on an elephant and his body was laid across the back of another elephant. The corps of Zu’lfiqār Khān with bare head and feet was tied by the tail of other elephant. The procession was met by Saiyid ‘Abdullah Khān near the city wall inside of the Delhi Gate. The crowd in the streets was immense; a greater had rarely been seen.

The writer puts blame on Mīr Jumlā for the execution of many Jahāndār Shāhi nobles. For Examples, Zu’lfiqār Khān, Asad Khān, Sad-ullāh Khān the dīwān-i-tan, Ḥidayat Khān the waqā’i’-nigār-i-Kul, Sidī Qasim Khān the qutwāl and many others were put to death after the Farrukh Siyar’s accession. He used to have power to interfere in all the matters and even wazīr could not check him. Further the author writes that Mīr Jumlā gave an impression upon Farrukh Siyar that the Saiyids are unfit for high office and that there would be no peace and prosperity in the empire as long as they play role in the administration. Mīr Jumlā blamed them for being haughty and ease loving and looking upon the Emperor as their creation and lowering the prestige of Emperor by disregarding his authority. Later these matters became the root cause of differences between Emperor and Saiyids.

---

37 ʻIbrat Nāma, op. cit., ff. 20a-21b
38 ʻIbid., f. 22b.
39 ʻIbid., ff. 29b-30a.
Further, Mirza Muhammad writes about influence of Mīr Jumlā and the account of two contemporary Shaikhs. One was Mullāh Shādman, a saintly man of Patna ‘Azim abād who had prophesied that Farrukh Siyar would gain the throne and from his cause the Prince had acquired the greatest confidence in his powers. The other Shaikh Qudrat-ullāh who belonged to Allahābād and was very close to ‘Azim -ush-Shān but after his death settled in Allahābād. Now thinking that Mullāh Shādman’s protection would be certain to secure him a favourable reception, joined him and both travelled together to Delhi. But just because of the jealousy Mīr Jumlā killed the Shaikh Qudrat-ullāh even without permission of Emperor. Due to this fear Mullāh Shādman also left that place and returned to his town.\(^{40}\)

Mirza Muhammad tries to give the picture of both sides and for the attitude of the Saiyids, he writes that they looked on Farrukh Siyar’s accession to the throne as their hand work and resented the grant of any share of power to other persons. As he quotes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{چون این دوبرژگ رادرخدمت بادشہ مراتب خدمتگاری و جانفسانی بدرجمه اتم ثابت بود بهم کس بالیفين میدانست که محض بسبيب رفاقت این بر دوبرادر تخت سلطنت نصيب انوالاگیب شده نظر برين امور سادات عالی درجات منت عظیم برزادشہ دا شتند و دیگر راکفوو قرین خود نمی انگاشتند و مخواستند درجمع امور کسی سیم و شریک، ایشان نباشد.}^{41}
\end{align*}
\]

(Even in the sight of Emperor they received the confident about their trustworthiness and braveness. Everyone knew that the Emperor grabbed the throne with help of them. For the reason that they had good expectation and favour from the Emperor, they do not like anybody equal to themselves and don’t like any individual share and interference in their businesses.)

On the other hand, the small group of Farrukh Siyar’s intimate men who had known him from his childhood and stood on the most familiar terms with him and were

---

\(^{40}\)Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., ff.27a-29a.

\(^{41}\)Ibid., f. 29b.
aggrieved at their exclusion from a share in the spoil. And so they planned to work upon the feeble minded Farrukh Siyar\textsuperscript{42}.

The author gives exhaustive details of all appointments for the posts and subas. One of the wives of Emperor Farrukh Siyar, Fakhr-un-Nisa daughter of Saʿādat Khān is mentioned in this writing as well. He has also noted about the death of the son of Farrukh Siyar named Jahāngīr Shāh due to smallpox\textsuperscript{43}. Then he gives story of Mīr Jumlā who was permitted to keep 5000 Mughal suwārs which were to be paid directly from the state treasury and was allotted jāgīr in the suba of Lahore. Earlier Mīr Jumlā had been made the subedār of Bengal and raised to the rank of 7000/7000. Khān-i-Daurān too was placed at the head of 5000 wālā-shāhi’s and allotted jāgīr in the subas of Delhi and Agra. He had earlier been appointed as the subedār of Agra and raised to the rank of 7000. A number of relatives of these two favourites of Emperor were also promoted and these two nobles were also allowed to have more than 10,000 men at his command\textsuperscript{44}.

It was at this juncture that Husain ‘Alī discovered a plot to murder him. According to Muʿtamad Khān the plot was to make Husain a prisoner when he came to present to the Emperor a son who had been born to him recently but this conspiracy was aborted by some palace servants\textsuperscript{45}.

Next plan of the Emperor was to offer the post of wīzārat to others. At the time of open trail of strength against the Saiyids, both Mīr Jumlāh and Khān-i-Daurān shrank from measuring their strength with that of the Saiyids Bārha. He quotes for them;

\textsuperscript{42}Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 29b.
\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., f. 25b.
\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., f. 30b.
\textsuperscript{45}Akhbārāt mention the birth of a son on May 15, 1714. According to Qasim Aurangabādī this plot was leaked by Lutf-ullāh Khān Sādiq and Ḵ̣aʃī Ḵ̣aʃā Khān includes Queen Mother herself, Muntakhab-ul-Lūbāb, op. cit., p. 740.
(They found better to offer the Khil’at to Mir Jumla and made him wazir. But that man was only the lion of the region of snow and knew his incompetence to fight in battle field. He pulled back himself for the task with pretend. Khan-i-Dauran a Hindustani boastful and was unable to perform any task. He was also terrified with the triumph of Saiyids in open battle and lost of his own lives.)

For them Mirza Muhammad Khan observes “they were only carpet knights, not true fighters” realizing their own weakness, they advised Farrukh Siyar to open negotiation with Mohammad Amīn Khan, the second bakhshi who was an experienced warrior under Aurangzeb.

For the future problems, he writes that Mohammad Amīn Khan was willing to undertake the task but in reward he wanted wīzārat for himself. For the Emperor and his favourites, this remedy became worse than the disease. If the Saiyids were removed with the help of Mohammad Amīn Khan, it would be even more difficult to get rid of him (Amīn Khan) afterwards. Amīn Khan was also aware about the instability in Emperor’s nature and politely denied for undertaking this task.

Finally, Emperor Farrukh Siyar fell back on compromise. Imperial servants were sent to the brothers; the Queen mother herself went to visit them and took the most solemn oath on her son’s behalf. At last it was agreed that both Mīr Jumlā and Husain ‘Alī should assume personal charge of their provinces. Khaṭī Khan says that Mīr Jumlā was appointed to Bihar only. Mirza Muhammad Khan says that he was appointed to both Bengal and Bihar. However Mīr Jumlā did not proceed beyond Patna.

This author sheds light on the contemporary gossips that whenever the Emperor planned a hunt or went on outing; rumours went round that attack on Abdullah Khan was intended. Further the author writes about the celebration of julūs year and writes about

46 Ḥibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 32ab.
47 Ibid., f. 31a.
48 Ibid., ff. 32b-33a.
49 Ibid., f. 33b.
earthquake that took place in the 2nd R.Y. of Farukh Siyar. Furthermore, he writes about the death of Saiyid Nūr-ud-Dīn ‘Alī Khān, the nephew of Saiyid Brothers over the tragic death after the fire burn. He throws ample light on the routine of Emperor like his hunting expedition or his visits to the tombs, in chronological order.

The author also mentions about the secret plot, in which Emperor send a letter to Daud Khān Panni to kill Husain ‘Alī Khān. A detail of the battle between Daud Khān and Saiyid Husain ‘Alī Khān is written but this author fails to mention about the source of information. Alongside, he also writes about calamities around, like, a heavy rain fall that perhaps occurred after hundred years.

Further writes an eyewitness description about the marriage of Emperor with the daughter of Ajit Singh, with all details like ceremonies, celebrations and gifts etc. He states about other important information related to Nizām-ul-Mulk like his diplomatic relation with all the successive rulers of Aurangzeb and also tells about the secret agreement that was made during the battle of Agra by the help of Nawāb ‘Abd-us-Samad Khān.

For the Sikhs expedition, he does not go for the causes but sheds ample light on its origin. He starts Sikh’s description from the account of Guru Nanak, to whom he writes a perfect saint (faqīr-i-kāmil). Then he writes about Guru Govind, about his Khalisa and his murder by an Afghan in Deccan as well. For Banda Bahādur he gives different account and says that a man named Ajit Singh who was also famous as his son and accompanied in the army of Bahādur Shāh from Deccan to North. Next year the same person (Ajit Singh) claim to be Guru Govind. Mirza Muhammad has used severe words for this Guru like Siyahru, (criminal) Sag-i-jhannamī (hellish dog), Mūridān-i-duzakh (hell) etc. Then he writes about the atrocities of his followers who started attack in the town of Sarhind and killed many of the inhabitants and plundered their houses. For
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the origin of this town he mentioned that Sarhind is an old prosperous town, inhabited by wealthy bankers and traders and many well born Muslim of learned class\textsuperscript{53}.

For the Sikh expedition of Saharanpur, he writes that ‘Alī Hāmid Khān Qanaujī faujdār of that part of the country took flight and in spite of help offered by Afghan and other leading nobles to repair the walls and to stand on the defensive. But on the very night he marched away from Saharanpur, and took the road to Delhi. The Sikh hearing, that the imperial officer had abandoned the town, made all haste to the spot, soon overcome the resistance of the inhabitants, plundered it as they had done in Sarhind. The whole country, far and near was in panic\textsuperscript{54}. Further he writes about the suffering of the inhabitant of that area. He writes that who were rich or lucky enough to obtain means of conveyance, carried of their goods and families. The rest taking their wives and children by the hand fled on foot. Women, who had rarely been outside of it on foot, were forced to walk distances of thirty and forty miles. Many women threw themselves into wells to avoid outrage. In this way, half of the sarkār of Saharanpur fell into the hand of Sikhs\textsuperscript{55}.

For the resistance of residents of Baith Jalandhar, the author notes that, inspite of disparity of number; the Muslims disdaining to flee offered a stout resistance. Many of the Sikhs were killed but the same time Shams Khān himself was among the slain\textsuperscript{56}. Emperor Bahādur Shāh appointed Isa Khān Miyan to be deputy faujdār of Baith Jalandher, and then Muhammad Amīn Khān Hasan Bahādur Firuz Jang and Ghāzī-ud-Dīn Khān Bahādur Rustam Jang who left the place and returned to the imperial camp with the object of taking part in the fight for the succession. The Guru saw his opportunity and once more took the possession of the town of Sadhaura and restored the fort of Lohgarh\textsuperscript{57}. Here Guru remained undisturbed for about two months when Jahāndār Shāh’s accession had taken place. Mirza Muhammad is the only writer who has given this account of Hasan Bahādur’s appointment by Jahāndār Shāh. By the order of Jahāndār Shāh, he was sent back to continue the campaign and Zain-ud-Dīn Ahmad
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Khān, faujdār of Chaklā Sarhind was ordered to put himself under that general’s order, for several months the investment of Sadhaura was maintained without result. Then towards the end of the year 1124 (Dec 1712), when Jahāndār Shāh left Delhi for Agra to oppose the advance of Farrukh Siyar, he recalled Hasan Bahādur. Thus the Sikh problem remained unsolved⁵⁸.

The author here notes that he now quits the reports of other and records what he witnessed with his own eyes. Mirza Mohammad and his brother were also with Rafī-ush-Shān’s division which was appointed to capture Guru in the reign of Bahādur Shāh⁵⁹.

Thus, Mirza Mohammad has devoted several pages for the incursion of Sikhs. For the reign of Farrukh Siyar, he writes that with the sincere effort of ‘Abd-us-Samad Khān this Guru was captured with his followers were 740 in numbers. They were brought to Shāhjahānābād and were killed by the order of Farrukh Siyar. Here, author offers an eye witness description about loyalty of his followers and about their fearless attitude and their conversation with the people of Shāhjahānābād. He was also a witness of their executions and writes that around hundred people were killed daily, thus it took one weak to finish them all. He reveals names of all those nobles who were sent from the time of Bahādur Shāh and upto Farrukh Siyar to suppress the Sikh incursions⁶⁰.

For the condition of Bihar he writes, Mīr Jumlā failed to deal satisfactorily with zamīndār of Bihar who were notoriously turbulent. During that time, this place was also considered one of the tumultuous areas since last many years. At the same time, he had woefully mismanaged his finances so that he was unable to pay his Mughal soldiers. The soldiers in turn committed every sort of excesses and oppression upon the people in order to extort money from them⁶¹.

When report approached the Emperor about these oppressions and that Mīr Jumlā is committing breach of the royal privileges and amusing by witnessing fight of lions, misappropriation of 30 Laks rupees, the tribute which was annually remitted from
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Bengal to Delhi and many more. Till Banaras, Mir Jumlā came openly, after that leaving every one behind; he started for Delhi in covered litter (doli), which was generally used for women. In few days, he reached at Delhi. The news about when he entered secretly during the night of 22nd Muḥarram 1128 A.H. (16th January 1716) came to author through a trustworthy person of his relation, named Mohammad Mīr, who had been in the Nawāb’s service at Patna. Mirza Muhammad clearly mentions about Emperor’s sympathy for him but just because of Qutb-ul-Mulk he did not dare to show. He eliminates the confusion created by other contemporary authors that Mīr Jumlā was called by Farrukh Siyar or not. It is Mirza Muhammad who clearly revealed that he had not come upon Emperor’s call (be ṭalab), instead of his own cause.

On March 1716, Mīr Jumlā was exiled first to Sarhind and then to Lahore. He had never abandoned hope of return to court, but Farruṣk Siyar was too frightened of Saiyid to accord his consent. However, as Mīr Jumlā perceived that out of fear of the wazīr, Farrûṣk Siyar would decline to see him, he decided to declare himself as an adherent of Saiyids. Accordingly, he went straight to Qutb-ul-Mulk’s house on 5th Zi qādā (29th September 1718 A.D) Mīr Jumlā owing to this conduct of Farruṣk Siyar professed to be very angry. All the titles were resumed from him, including the office of dārogha of pages (khwās) and dārogha of the post office (dāk), which was conferred on his deputies, Amīn-ud-Dīn Khan Bahādur and Mirza Khan. The government of ‘Azimabād Patna was transferred to Sarbuland Khan. This became the main reason for the wazīr to write (5th Zī qādā/29th September 1718 A.D) to his brother Husain ‘Alī Khan requesting him to leave the Deccan right away and return to Delhi.

He has shown interest in many trivial details like murder of Saiyid Shujāt Khan Bārha, account of Khwāja Bāsīt son of Muhammad Jafar, skirmish between Amīn Chīn Qūlīk Khan and Khān-i-Daurān and detail about other Mughal officials. Furthermore, Mirza Muhammad states the reason for appointing Jai Singh, only for the campaign against Jāts by the Emperor. As he did not want the rise of Jāt power under Chūrāman
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Jāt on the borders of his hereditary dominion, apart from, the irritation caused to him by the constant plundering activities of the Jāts, relations between the house of Amber and the Jāts had been strained since the time of Aurangzeb when Jai Singh’s father, Ram Singh had fought a series of exhausting wars with Rājāram Jāt. After the death of Rājāram, the headship of the Jāts had passed to Chūrāman Jāt.65

Mirza Muhammad has written an account of Chūrāman Jāt starting from Bahādur Shāh with details of appointments of imperial nobles. On many places, he has also written the reasons of success and failure of imperial nobles. This author openly writes the secret help which were always provided to Jāts by the Saiyids against the imperial interest.66 For the difficulties of Rājā Jai Singh Sawāi, author writes that he was never distinguished as a soldier or general in the field, and in spite of all he could do, the siege dragged for twenty months. The rains (in 1717 A.D) came very late, prices rose very high, and great expenses fell upon the Rājā in bringing supplies from his own watan of Amber.67 Here the author clearly reveals a key point about the support of Jāts through Khān-i-Jahān, a relative to wazīr (karshīkni as rafīqa-i-au), was fatal to success of Jai Singh.68 At length Chūrāman made overtures to Qutb-ul-Mulk through his agent at Delhi offering a tribute of thirty lākh of rupees to the government and a present of twenty lākh for the minister himself. There upon Qutb-ul-Mulk espoused the cause of Jāts. At the same time, a flattering farmān was dispatched to Rājā Jai Singh, informing him that Chūrāman has made overtures which had been accepted, and now onwards all hostilities must cease against the Jāts. By this time Rājā Jai Singh believed that victory was within his grip and by this negotiation over his head the whole fruit of his labour was taken from him. Although inwardly raging and being disappointed he obeyed orders, withdrew his men and raised the siege.69

According to the author, the ill will of Qutb-ul-Mulk and Rājā Jai Singh is said to have arisen in the following way. When the Rājā first came to Farrukh Siyar’s court he

65ʻIbrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 65a.
66ʻIbid., f. 65b.
67ʻIbid., f. 85a.
68ʻIbid.
69ʻIbid., ff. 64b&86b.
found himself very favourably received by the new Emperor. When he found the sovereign is gracious to him, never thought of paying much attention to anyone else. Believing he has secured in the Emperor good graces, Rājā Jai Singh neglected to ask for the support and favour of Qutb-ul-Mulk. The wazīr resented this neglect. He was further annoyed about the campaign against Chūrāman, a matter in which his advice had not been sought. Thus, he privately applied himself to prevent the Rājā from reaping the reward of his undertakings\(^{70}\).

For Inayat-ullāh Khān Kashmirī, he writes he had gone to Mecca towards the beginning of the reign and after the execution of his son Sad-ullāh Khān, he returned to the court\(^{71}\). Farruḵh Siyar was now of the opinion that it was a mistake to have rooted out the old ‘Ālamgiri nobles who was experienced administrator and who could have acted as a counterpoise to the Saiyids. Inyat-ullāh Khān had been trained under Aurangzeb, knew the rules of business, and was spoken of as being economy minded. Hence, at the behest of some of his advisors, Farruḵh Siyar proposed to appoint him as the dīwān-i-tan wa khālīsa. He was made absentee governor of Kashmir and granted the rank of 4000 in April 1717 A.D\(^{72}\).

Mirza Muhammad Khān gives the reason for imposing jizya in the reign of Farruḵh Siyar. For some time, things went smooth, but soon disagreement arose. First of all, ‘Inayat-ullāh Khān an admirer of Aurangzeb produced a letter from the Sharif of Mecca stating that the levying of jizya was obligatory (wājib) according to Sharia. He also further writes about the other economic measure of ‘Inayat-ullāh Khān\(^{73}\).

He throws ample light on the preparations made by both the groups (Emperor and Saiyids) against each other. He has also tried to cover the rumour which was one of the main causes of the differences between them. Once, Farruḵh Siyar projected a wide plan to arrest ‘Abdullah Khān, but the secret of the plot was leaked to ‘Abdullah Khān and he

\(^{70}\) ʻIbrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 84b.
\(^{71}\) Ibid., f. 69a.
\(^{72}\) Ibid., f. 71b.
\(^{73}\) Ibid., f. 71b.
engaged a large number of men from all sections of the population\textsuperscript{74}. Further, Mirza writes the compulsion of Farrukh Siyar to choose Muhammad Murād Kashmiri against Saiyids, as he knew, if he takes help from Tūrānī group, it would be even more difficult to get rid of them afterwards. Hence, Farrukh Siyar picked on a newly risen favourite, Muhammad Murād Kashmiri for the post of wazīr. Contrary to power belief and assertions, Murād Kashmiri was not of low birth, but he was the usual type of courtier, i.e. a sycophant and a boastful (sukhan saz). His rise alienated Khān-i-Daurān and old nobles who were no more prepared to take orders from Muhammad Murād Khān than from Mīr Jumla earlier\textsuperscript{75}.

Author writes about his last stupid measures which proved the reason for alienation of all leading nobles and helpful for the Saiyids. Emperor took away the faujdāri of Murādābād from Nizām-ul-Mulk, converted it into a province and conferred it upon his new favourite, Muhammad Murād\textsuperscript{76}.

For an old ‘Ālamgīr’s noble, he writes that in the pursuance of plan to restore the older men to office, Saiyid ‘Āmir Khān Ūlwī, who was then fort commander of Agra, was recalled to court, he and his relatives were presented on the 9\textsuperscript{th} Rajab 1129 A.H. (18\textsuperscript{th} June 1717 A.D). Mirza Muhammad, who as a page (khawāsān) and had served under this man in ‘Ālamgīr’s reign, was of opinion that his age (he being seventy four) and his failing memory rendered him unfit for active employment. Samsām-ud-Daulā being of the same opinion and seeing that old man could never become a dangerous rival pushed his claims and Farrukh Siyar’s consent to this change was only reluctantly given\textsuperscript{77}.

According to Mirza Muhammad, Saiyid ‘Āmir Khān’s original name was Abdul Karim, he was son of Amir Khān Senior, son of Qāsim Khān Namkin. His father died when he was very young. Then he received a daily allowance for a long period and eventually obtained a small mansab and rose gradually under ‘Ālamgīr. He succeeded Anwar Khān as superintendent of the pages, an office that he held for more than fifteen
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year and up to the death of 'Ālamgīr. He had become Khānāzād Khān Ḥafiz and finally 'Āmir Khān. In Bahādur Shāh’s reign, he was subedār of Agra up to the end of his reign. In Jahāndār Shāh’s reign, he was replaced by Muhammad Mah (entitled 'Āzam Khān) and transformed to charge of Agra fort.  

For the rise and fall of the Muhammad Murād, author says that he was already a man of about sixty two years of age and was a native of Kashmir, of the tribe called Audasd. For time, he was in the employment of Mīr Malik Husain Khān Jahān Kokaltāsh Khān the foster brother of 'Ālamgīr and was agent at court for that noble’s son Sipahdur Khān. This happy state of things lasted only for a year or two, until Khwāja Amīn fell into disgrace, Mohammad Murād retired to Delhi, where he lived in obscurity.  

The reason for further closeness of 'Itiqād Khān with Emperor was his appointment on the post of Mīr Tūzuk with the title of Wakalat Khān. Then he became dārogha of the harkārā or scouts with the privilege of admission at all times to the privy audience chamber, the chapel and secret audience room. Having now private access to Emperor, he repeated plainly with details, what he had formerly suggested by hints and signs. Muhammad Murād boldly counseled him to be bold and not to be afraid. He says “no one has the strength to oppose you, you should free your heart from fear and issue whatever orders you may please.”  

In the interval, Farrukh Siyar pursuing his endeavors to destroy the Saiyids, had recourse first to 'Itiqad Khān and then to Sarbuland Khān. Sarbuland Khān’s defection did not trouble Farrukh Siyar very much, his hopes now centered in his father in law Maharājā Ajit Singh, for whom he had sent through Nahar Khān, the only person believed to have sufficient influence over the Rājā to secure his adhesion. But in actuality Nahar Khān was intimate friend of the two Saiyids and his mind was fully made
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up to espouse the cause of Saiyids. According to author, this secret was not known to Emperor.82

At the time of reaching Shāhjahānābād, Ajit Singh showed his inclination fully to Saiyids. This made the Emperor very much upset. For twenty days, neither the wazīr nor the Rājā reappeared at darbār. In this interval, the Rājā visited Qutb-ul-Mulk only once or twice, and the Nawāb went once to him. As soon as he found that Nawāb and Rājā are united, Farrukh Siyar returned to the idea of reconciliation. For several days in succession ‘Itiqād Khān visited them with proposals for peace and concord. It leaked out however that Qutb-ul-Mulk placed no reliance on ‘Itiqād Khān’s words. The negotiation therefore was transferred to Afzal Khān, the Sadar-us-sudur but with equal want of good result.83

Nizām-ul-Mulk was next to be appealed for the task against Saiyids. But, seeing clearly the Emperor’s want of firmness he declined to undertake the responsibility himself. Nizām saw plainly enough that on these conditions the enterprise was hopeless and therefore amused the Emperor with procrastinating words, without committing himself. A few months afterwards (16th Safar 1131 A.H/ 7th January 1719 A.D), Farrukh Siyar in his heedless, shortsighted way, finally alienated Nizām-ul-Mulk by removing him from his appointment in Chakla Murādābād, which was then elevated to subah and conferred it to on his favourite ‘Itiqād Khān.84 On his suggestion his cousin Mohammad Amīn Khān was recalled. Mirza Muhammad showed his belief that it is doubtless, if Nizām-ul-Mulk and Muhammad Amīn Khān could have believed in the truth of the promises made to them and had properly supported in all probability the two Saiyid would have been uprooted easily enough. But Farrukh Siyar was a prey to unreasoning terrors and he could never come to any firm resolution.85

Some incidents which turned Muhammad Amīn Khān’s heart from the Farrukh Siyar and made him friendly to the cause of Saiyids, at last to the extent of securing his
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neutrality. At this point, few other changes may be noted as consequence of Mohammad Amīn Khān’s loss of favour. The post of ḥādis wālā shāhī which was held by his son Qamar-ud-Dīn Khān was given to Zafar Khān Turra Baz. Then ‘Inayat-ullāh Khān, with whom Qutb-ul-Mulk was displeased for his refusal to bow before the authority of Rājā Ratan Chand, as result of it ‘Inayat-ullāh Khān lost his appointment of dīwān. But Farruḵh Siyar believed in this man’s honesty, he was not kept altogether empty and finally transferred to the post of khān-i-sāmān (Lord Steward). Qutb-ul-Mulk was asked to carry on the duties till someone else was nominated. 

For further incidents, author states that whenever Farruḵh Siyar heard that Husain ʻAlī Khān had been written to, he sent Samsām-ud-Daulā to ally wazīr’s apprehension. On the 26th Zi qādā (30th September 1718 A.D) he went on hunting, and on his way home sent a message that he was about to honor Qutb-ul-Mulk with a visit. As soon as the Emperor heard of the Rājā Ajit Singh’s presence, he could not control his anger. He countermanded his orders and sent Najm-ud-Dīn ʻAlī Khān to say, that if base born pig (khuk haramzāda) had not been at the wazīr’s house, he would have paid him a visit. Farruḵh Siyar was now in the state of terror at the approach of Husain ʻAlī Khān who was well known for his violence of temper and vigor of purpose. He and his advisors thought it prudent therefore to win over Qutb-ul-Mulk, so that he might act as a peace maker and not as an increase of strife.

Accordingly, on the 26th Muharram (18th December 1718 A.D), Farruḵh Siyar embarked in his boat on the Jamuna and was taken to the wazīr’s door. Qutb-ul-Mulk came out to meet him and bowed his head as to touch the Emperor’s feet. Rich offerings were brought and presented. Other attempts of reconciliation of Emperor which were noticed by this author, was to establish settlement between Rājā Jai Singh Sawāi and Qutb-ul-Mulk. Jai Singh was displeased at the part which Qutb-ul-Mulk had played in the
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Mirza Muhammad says that Sarbuland Khan and Samsam-ud-Daula went on the behalf of the Emperor and invited Ajit Singh and Saiyids to come to court. The two envoy nobles went to the palace with Qutb-ul-Mulk and Raja Ajit Singh successfully. Speeches full of apparent peace and good will were interchanged among them. For sometimes, it seemed as outwardly all cause of quarrel between the parties had been removed.

For further tensions he writes, On the 27th Rabii’I 1131 A.H (16th Feb 1719 A.D) Husain Ali Khan at the head of his army, estimated to include 30,000 horsemen marched to Wazirabad one of the imperial hunting preserves about four miles north of the city on the Jumna bank. By this time he had often been heard to say that as he no longer considered himself to be in the imperial services why should he respect the imperial etiquette. The sovereign’s anger or the loss of rank having no terror left for him. Disregarding the rules of antiquates and playing the naubat within one mile of the capital, he marched in with sovereign state, kettle drums beating and clarions sounding.

For the last attempt of the Raja Jai Singh, the author notes that on several times Raja pointed out to Farrukh Siyar and gave many indications that the other side meant to come to no arrangement. It would well before matters went beyond mending, to take the field and should attack upon the Saiyids. All would rally to his side, he had with him nearly 20,000 expert and trusty horsemen and until the last breath had left his body he would fight for his master. All was in vain as the Emperor did not accept his advice. Few days afterwards, it seems yielding to the instance of Qutb-ul-Mulk, Emperor ordered Raja Jai Singh to march from Delhi to their watan.

Here author writes about cleverness of ‘Abdullah Khan for alienating all the leading nobles from Emperor. He wins them over by promising Governorship of Kabul.
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to Sarbuland Khān and of Bihar to Nizām-ul-Mulk. Mirza Muhammad clarifies that Muhammad Amīn Khān had been recalled (hash-ul-hukm) from Malwā by Farruṣkh Siyar. But even Muhammad Amīn Khān was also cleverly won over to his own side by Qutb-ul-Mulk\textsuperscript{94}.

He has noted that the important conference which was held on 19\textsuperscript{th} February by Husain ‘Alī, Abdullah Khān, Ajit Singh and Bhīm Singh Hārā it was decided that the Saiyids should demand the posts of the dārogah-i-dīwān-e-khas and Mīr Ātish before Husain ‘Alī would go to the fort for an audience with the Emperor and handover the captive Prince to him. The other posts which gave access to the Emperor, such as the post of dārogah-i-khawāsān should also be filled, and that the fort should be placed under their control at the time of interview. On Feb 20, on the advice of ‘Iltiqad Khān, Farruṣkh Siyar decided to yield to demands of the Saiyids and the posts of the dārogah-i-khawāsān, Mīr Ātish, dārogha-i-khawāsān, dārogha-i-jilau (superintendent of royal attendants and the special retinue) and Nazīr harem were conferred upon the nominees of the Saiyids\textsuperscript{95}.

Then, Qutb-ul-Mulk and Ajit Singh came to the palace early in the morning removed all the imperial guards, substituted men of their own. At three hour after sunrise, Husain ‘Alī Khān set out for audience. Owing to the great cowards, progress was slow and palace was not reached till close upon three pahar. On the arrival of Saiyids in the hall of audience, the few remaining eunuchs and pages were turned out, leaving only the two brothers and Ajit Singh with the Emperor. Husain ‘Alī Khān bowed down to kiss the feet of Emperor, but Farruṣkh Siyar stopped this act of homage, put his arms round him and embraced him. Not a single soul was left in attendance on the Emperor except ‘Iltiqād Khān, Zafar Khān and two or three eunuchs. For this incidence the author seems to depend upon the information of Zafar Khān\textsuperscript{96}.

For the further developments, he states that as Emperor decided for hunting expedition, suspicion arose in the Saiyids minds that this was a mere pretext for flight to
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Jai Singh’s camp, which was not then very far off. Qutb-ul-Mulk at once wrote to the Emperor that on that day, Husain ‘Alī Khān craved an audience for the purpose of delivering the captive Prince brought from Deccan and taking his own leave before returning to the provinces of Deccan. Here writer indicates about the simplicity of the Emperor, who was overjoyed at the prospect of at last obtaining possession of his dreaded rival.\footnote{\textit{Ibrat Nāma}, op. cit., f. 116b.}

Mirza Muhammad writes, evidently it seems as there existed peace and no problems between them. But the Saiyids were impatient at the delay in the handing over of the actual charge of various offices to their nominees and suspected that Farrukh Siyar is only playing for time in order that he might resort to some new trick. At the end Farrukh Siyar was ready to hand over the keys of the fort, but could not control his anger and perhaps used some harsh words for Saiyid ‘Abdullah Khān and went into harem. Unlike other sources this author does not mention any abusive language for Saiyids from Emperor, except some callous sentences remarked for ‘Itiqād Khān. Inspite of all these, Abdullah was ready for \textit{khutba} and \textit{Sikkah} in the name of Emperor Farrukh Siyar. But Husain ‘Alī was not ready for it and wanted the deposition of the Emperor.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, f. 119a.}

For the account of Maratha and Mughal clashes which occur spontaneously, he writes as, ‘Abdullah Khān repeatedly asked Farrukh Siyar to come out of the harem and dismiss their remaining opponents but Farrukh Siyar refused. Meanwhile, wild rumors of the death of Emperor at the hands of Ajit Singh was spread in the town and several Marathas troops of Husain ‘Alī clashed with Mughal troops of Muhammad Amīn Khān and were assailed by the riff-raff in the city and the unemployed Mughal soldiers. Around four thousand Maratha soldiers and also his leader Sambhaji were slain and compelled to leave the town. Two or three leaders of refute test their lives, among them the chief Santa, who commanded some five or six thousand horsemen. From the gate of the fort to the entrance of hunting preserve, and the market (\textit{mandavi}) and \textit{takiya} of Majnun Shāh, a distance of three or four \textit{kos}, bodies were to be seen in every direction. The stain included many men who from the darkness of their complexion had been
mistaken for Maratha. All the Aftābgīr a kind of standard which the Marathas carry as a mark of honour, one to every fifteen or twenty horsemen had disappeared\textsuperscript{99}.

This author also shows about the last attempt of Farrukh Shahi nobles. The fight of these nobles went on for few times. Saʿādat Khān had pushed on as far as the Chabutra or Police office in Chandni Chauk, where he received gunshot and swords which forced him to retire. His son a youth was made prisoner and taken to Husain ʿAli Khān. Ghāzī-ud-Dīn Khān fought his best, but he had no disciplined troops and few followers only\textsuperscript{100}. About midday the news spread that Farrukh Siyar was made prisoner and that another Prince had been raised to throne. Then the drum beat started within palace to announce the new reign. In spite of this, the opposing nobles stood their ground and resisted until the afternoon when at least they saw that there was no further hope of success as saying is to beat cold iron is profitless they dispersed full of apprehension to their homes. Finally, the disturbance ceased\textsuperscript{101}.

Unique information which is provided by this author is, as seeing the situations ʿAbdullah Khān was forced to take action and then another meeting was held and the name of Bedār Dil was suggested. But his mother was not ready to hand over his son to Saiyids and hid him in small locked room. Then the supporters of Saiyids found Rafī-ud-Darajāt who was younger to Bedār Dil and better intelligent than others\textsuperscript{102}. Then they brought him in court and seated him on the throne. He quotes as;

بعداد کنگاش قرعہ سلطنت و مشورت بنام شابازداد بیدار دل سراسن و ااعقل سابزادبا بود چون بھنداریان بر درحولی بادشازاداد مجتمع گشنند عورت گمان برذند ک مچون فرخ سیر را دستگیر کرده اند میخوائند ک گم وارثان ملک را مقتول ساختند و شابازادا را دردرون حجره پنهان کردن بر چند اجماعت گفتند ک ماملد ایم تا فلائی شابازادا را براورده ببادشاپی بردارم مسموع نيفتادوسک چوب بمانعت پیش آمدند چون وقت مقتفی توقف نبود و احتمال فتنه غالب نواب حکم کرد تا جمعی از تردارای دروازه راشکشتی بیرونی درامدن اول خوائستن تا بادشازادا ک امر سلطنت بنام او

\textsuperscript{99}Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 118ab.
\textsuperscript{100}Ibid., f. 118b.
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(In the minute of meeting decided that Prince Bedār Dil should be placed on the throne because he is elder among and more heedful. When men of Saiyid went to his palace, women were in mind that they have confined Farruḵh Siyer already and intending to finish all the descendants and ascend the throne themselves, with this intention, these women closed the door from inside and hid the Prince. They were continuously making statement that we have come here for particular Prince to let him honour as King but the women were not ready to put ear to hear single word and indicating their refusal through small wooden stick. It was such period of havoc they cannot wait for a moment and even before the Nawab place order a group of men including gatekeeper brake the door and entered in the palace. Initially, they intended to take the Prince about whom it was decided in minute of meeting but her mother was crying in complete broken heart and hidden the key of the room where she kept his son. Therefore, they (men of Saiyid) pulled back their hand and turned to other sons of Rafi-ud-Shan. Among them, they found Prince Rafi-ud-Darajat, the younger one, who was better in sense; they took him along with full honour and dignity to Qutb-ul-Mulk).

On the other side around three or four hundred soldiers were sent into the imperial apartment. A number of the women seized weapons and tried to resist, some were slain and some wounded. The weeping and lamentation of the ladies passed unheeded. The door of the small room where he was hiding having been broken in the wretched Farruḵh Siyar despairing of life came out armed with sword and shield and fought with the stony hearted ruffians. In that dire extremity these fruitless and untimely efforts availed him nothing. His mother, his wife, his daughter and other ladies grouped themselves around him and tried to shelter him. The shrieking women were pushed on one side with scant regards. The men surrounded him and hemmed him in, they then laid hold of him by the
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hand and neck, his turban fell off and with every mark of indignity he was dragged and pushed from his retreat\textsuperscript{104}.

Here, author laments and points out to Hifz-ullah Khān (later known as Murtaza Khān) and Mūrid Khān. These nobles in order to ingratiate themselves with Qutb-ul-Mulk went with those hard hearted men, thus in one moment wiping out the loyal services done to the line of time for more than a century past by their grandfather and father\textsuperscript{105}. It was pitiful to see this strongman perhaps the handsomest and most powerful built of Babar’s race that had ever occupied the throne dragged bare headed and barefooted\textsuperscript{106}. On this occasion he quotes;

\begin{quote}
_mbīn 南非鲁省 weapon_\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
(Do not look at a King whose head is down out of embarrassment. Such a king in such slavery)
\end{quote}

Several other information regarding the reign of Farrukh Siyar has been pointed out by this author. A number of places he states about heavy rains, floods, earthquakes, terror of robbery, atrocities done by Sikh Guru on the common people of Sarhind and Saharanpur, description of Muslim women of lower class, details of journey like routes, average covered distance, halt, name of sarāī, etc\textsuperscript{108}. This author gave some other information related to Emperor like his visit to tombs, hunting expeditions, birth celebrations of princes, imperial marriages, decorations, and ceremonies like sāchak (presents sent to bride), hinabandī, nikāh and duration of celebrations\textsuperscript{109}. Other important point of this author is his unique description of age of all nobles, as he does not fail to write the age of any official especially on the time of their death\textsuperscript{110}.

The shortcomings of this work are as he does not mention anything clearly about his motivation that what things inspire him to write this work. It appears he had no view
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points and no prejudices and it has enhanced the value of his work from the historical point of view but it has also resulted in making it uninteresting and dry record of facts. Perhaps his experience of the actual working of the administrative machinery was much more intimation than that of others. What factors were responsible for his lack of point of view? Either it was due to disinterest or was deliberate attempt to keep out of controversies. However, he is far superior so far as clarity of expression and sincerity of views is concerned.

The other demerits of this source are that it fails to give causations of any events and he only narrates the happening of his period. This work does not cover much detail about the reign of Bahādur Shāh and Jahāndār Shāh. Being eyewitness he has avoided giving details of many events. Wars of successions among the sons of Aurangzeb are written but, not any detail for prince ʻĀzam Shāh and Prince Kām Bakhsh has been given. Insdie of serving in Deccan for long time, he has not given any detail about Marathas. Like his contemporaries, he has much focused on political aspect only and failed to write about the contemporary society. There is not much information related to jizia or economy in his writing. This work also lacks in topographical details and day to day events of the time. No notice is taken of Emperor’s policies or his thinking or even his personal virtues and vices. This author also tries to highlight the personalities of his supporter like ʻInayat-ullāh Khān Kashmiri by writing as good nature like angel (nek sarish farishta fitrat) and his son Hidayat-ullāh Khān, who was murdered by the instance of Mīr Jumlā. Possibly, it can be one of the causes for this author’s bitterness for Mīr Jumlā. At many places, he has used abusive language for the Sikh Guru, Chūrāman Jāt and Maharājū Ajit Singh but this act does not seem as a result of communal intentions.

Mirza Muhammad has adhered closely to the chronological sequence of events; he has made history a dull drab and insipid affair. Perspective of the author is hemmed in by the court and camp and unrelated to the social and economic background of the period. No one can gather from this work, what social and cultural forces were at work when one of the greatest empires of the middle ages was being declined. The author does
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not mention the date of starting of this work. It also not clears whether this work is written on the daily basis or based on his memory. But from its thorough study, it seems this work was written around the last year of Farrukh Siyar. Other shortcoming of this work is, as on many places he failed to explain the reason and significance of the particular events and stated plainly “God alone knows the truth."

The significance of this source is, it is one of the unprejudiced accounts from the last year of Aurangzeb till the accession of Rafī-ud-Darajāt. He has not copied anything from any other earlier source and only narrates the contemporary account of the court. Being appointed on the post of khawāsān, he was an eyewitness for most parts of his works. Resultantly he was successfully able to write about the biographies of leading nobles of that time like Nawāb Asad Khān, Jai Singh, ‘Isa Khān, Mukarram Khān, ‘Inayat-ullāh Khān Kashmiri, Khwāja Bāsit, Murād Kashmirī and Jalāl Khān. So we can assert that he has tried to cover even those nobles who were even ignored by Shāhnawāz Khān in his Ma’āsir-ul-Umarā. Other important aspect of this work is that the author has used very rich chronology for every event. Year, month, date day, pahar even ghari and pal were mentioned by this author. On failing to recall the date, he clearly mentions about juhūl Tārīkh for that particular incident. This source throws sufficient light on the administrative problems especially related to the Jāgīrdārī crises. It is one of the detailed accounts related to the reign of Farrukh Siyar. All the transfers, appointments, skirmishes among the nobles are mentioned here. This source has also given details about the relations of Emperor with nobles and also among the leading nobles. Unlike his contemporaries, he has put an effort to his best to show the effect of parties and politics of the centre on local administrations, especially at pargana level.

Mirza Muhammad is the only contemporary author who clarifies that it was not the Saiyid Brothers who were mainly responsible for the deposition of the Emperor Farrukh Siyar. He writes that it was the Tūrānī nobles Muhammad Amīn Khān who gave first instance for the deposition of Emperor. Other nobles who held frequent
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consultations with Husain ‘Alī Khān also advised for the deposition of Farrukh Siyar. Even Khān-i-Daurān and Ajit Singh gave the same advice.117

It is worth mentioning that whatever he writes is characterized by objectivity in approach. Nowhere his account is marred by the suppression of truth. It helps us fill the gaps left by other historians and also corrective to the biased account of his contemporaries. Uniqueness of this source lays in the fact that it was written in a very balanced way and without any partisans and prejudiced. Mirza Muhammad’s description of Farrukh Siyar’s marriage is so vivid and graphic and it brings to mind every detail of Mughal marriage ceremonies. Internal strife between Saiyids and Farrukh Siyar is without personal touches of author which make his narrative superb and graphic. At the end of this work, being a contemporary account of the Saiyids, who were one of the supreme power authorities, so he avoided outright condemnation of the Saiyid Brothers’ conduct towards deposed Emperor. He builds up his criticism in the praise of Emperor Farrukh Siyar and writes in between the lines. It is very fascinating piece of historical composition written as a memoir and significant as historical treatise. This work is therefore brief, but gives sufficiently detailed information for the Farrukh Siyar’s reign. In brief, we can say that it is significant work pertaining the details like early life of Farrukh Siyar, description of Saiyid Brothers and other important personalities of the time, a critical account of events and circumstances leading to the conflict between the Emperor and his ministers, rise of faction feuds, the tragedy that over took him.

Conclusively, we can say that it is a memoir of an important Mughal officer who was employed during the last reign of Aurangzeb and worked upto the end of Farrukh Siyar. This author can be regarded as more successful historian because he approached subject matter in a nonpartisan way and recorded the facts more objectively and clearly. Besides, court politics and significant biographical notices of some important nobles are written. This source also sheds fair light on the working pattern and aspect of local administration. This work provides reasonable space for the accounts of Rajputs, Jāts, and Sikh problems of that period. Several anecdotal matters were also written by this author. It contains extensive information on variety of subjects within the limitation of

117 Ibrat Nāma, op. cit., f. 116ab.
the narrative of political events. This is one of the rich chronological sources. This source contains some unique information about the accession of Rafī-ud-Darajāt and about the relations among the nobles of Farruḵh Siyar. This has been acknowledged to be one of the best and most impartial histories of the period. Although, this source deals mainly politics period, however this source is considered one of the important eyewitness accounts particularly for the reign of Farruḵh Siyar.